

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 14, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-11 and 20 were rejected and claims 12-19 and 21-26 were withdrawn from consideration. With this Amendment, the title is amended, claims 1, 6, 10 and 11 are amended, withdrawn claims 12-19 and 21-26 are canceled and new claims 27-40, which are supported by the Specification, are added. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11, 20 and 27-40 are respectfully requested.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant submits herewith the Information Disclosure Statement mailed on September 22, 2003 that includes references that have yet to be acknowledged as well as copies of those references. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of those references.

Title

In the Office Action, the Examiner required that a new title be submitted because the current title is not descriptive. With the Amendment, the Applicant has submitted a new title.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10 and 11 are amended in accordance with page 10, lines 13-24 of the Specification. Claims 10 and 11 now clearly recite that the fluid flow of the first liquid transfers the object from the first end to the second end. It is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yanagi et al. (U.S. 4,893,320). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

It is respectfully submitted that Yanagi et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claim

elements of independent claims 1 and 20. Claim 1 recites that “the first liquid has a first dissolved gas concentration of a first gas and the second liquid has a second dissolved gas concentration of a second gas, the first dissolved gas concentration is different than the second dissolved gas concentration”. Claim 20 recites that “the first liquid has a dissolved gas concentration of a first gas that is greater than a dissolved gas concentration of a second gas in the second liquid”. As noted by the Examiner on page four of the Office Action, Yanagi et al. fails to teach or suggest these recited features.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 20 are allowable over Yanagi et al. as well as dependent claims 2-9, which depend on an allowable base claim 1.

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S. 6,138,698). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

It is respectfully submitted that Tanaka et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of independent claims 1 and 20. Claim 1 recites that “the first liquid has a first dissolved gas concentration of a first gas and the second liquid has a second dissolved gas concentration of a second gas, the first dissolved gas concentration is different than the second dissolved gas concentration”. Claim 20 recites that “the first liquid has a dissolved gas concentration of a first gas that is greater than a dissolved gas concentration of a second gas in the second liquid”. As noted by the Examiner on page five of the Office Action, Tanaka et al. fails to teach or suggest these recited features.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 20 are allowable over Tanaka et al. as well as dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9, which depend on an allowable base claim 1.

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (JP 11008214). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

It is respectfully submitted that Saito et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of independent claims 1 and 20. Claim 1 recites that “the first liquid has a first dissolved gas concentration of a first gas and the second liquid has a second dissolved gas concentration of a

second gas, the first dissolved gas concentration is different than the second dissolved gas concentration". Claim 20 recites that "the first liquid has a dissolved gas concentration of a first gas that is greater than a dissolved gas concentration of a second gas in the second liquid". Saito et al. fails to teach or suggest these recited features.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 20 are allowable over Tanaka et al. as well as dependent claims 2-5 and 7-9, which depend on allowable base claim 1.


Claims 27-40 have been added. Elements in new claims 27-40 can be found in the Specification and the original claims. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 27-34 are allowable over the cited references as depending on allowable base claims 1 and 20. Claims 35-40 are also allowable over the cited references for claiming features of allowable claims 1 and 20.

In view of the above comments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11, 20 and 27-30 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme